

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

			-	-	_		
P.O. Box 1450							
Alexandria, Virginia	2221	2	1.1	50	١.		
	اردد	,,	14	Э,	,		
www.usmo.gov							

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/934,699	08/22/2001	Satoru Okamoto	SEL 273	9139	
7	7590 08/25/2006	EXAMINER			
,	X, MCFARRON, MA	DUONG, THOI V			
Suite 2850	& MEHLER, LTD.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	200 West Adams St.		2871		
Chicago, IL	60606		DATE MAILED: 08/25/2000	5/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
09/934,699	OKAMOTO ET AL.			
Examiner	Art Unit			
Thoi V. Duong	2871			

	Thoi V. Duong	2871						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 August 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{03}$ months from the mailing dat	a) The period for reply expires <u>03</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is late no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to	out prior to the date of filing a brief	, will not be entered b	ecause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con	nsideration and/or search (see NO							
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•							
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li></ul>			the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•						
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)   how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		II be entered and an e	explanation of					
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11,16-19,21-27 and 34-51</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and	t before or on the date of filing a N	otice of Appeal will no	ot be entered					
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	•							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument that the combination of the references is improper, te examiner recognizes that obviousness can only established by combining or modyfying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where theris some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of skill in the art. In this case, Priestman discloses a portable electronic device comprising a first LCD panel and a second LCD panel. Nakai and Yamazaki are employed for teaching an active matrix type LCD panel and an active matrix EL display respectively, which could be applicable to the portable electronic device. Accordingly, it is obvious that one skill in the art could modify the portable electronic device of Priestman the teachings of Nakai and Yamazaki in order to obtain a portable display device comprising a liquid crystal display panel and an EL display panel having an excellent display performance (Nakai, col. 2, lines 56-60) and also a downsized and lightened device with a low power consumption (Yamazaki, col. 6, lines 51-59). Thus, the combination of the cited prior arts suggests the claimed invention and the rejection is proper.

TOANTON PROMARY EXAMINER